



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

already distinguished themselves as pioneers in geography and ethnography. All expeditions of this kind are sadly in want of scientific instructions and the supervision of a central institution. The millions which England spends on Bibles and missions in order to raise peoples of inferior grades to a higher civilisation, would be more effective if they were applied to expeditions for inquiring into the wants of the respective peoples as they actually are."

This suggestion reflects the greatest credit on Dr. Vollgraff, considering that it was thrown out in 1853, before anthropology was much cultivated in this country.

In conclusion, it may be stated that Dr. Vollgraff is the author of numerous important works, all more or less crotchety. His chief work, *The System of Practical Politics*, is full of speculations. In one of his later publications, *Die Täuschungen des Repräsentativsystems* (The illusions of the representative system), he endeavours to show that the representative system is an "ungerman" institution, not at all adapted to the German nations. This bold assertion greatly excited the ire of the Marburg radical students, who straightway settled the question by making a bonfire with their professor's books; forgetting that they were thus to some extent illustrating the truth of their professor's teachings.

We neither think better nor worse of the author because of this literary *auto-da-fé*. Many better books have experienced the same fate, but their respective authors were generally in advance of their age, and this also seems to be the case of Dr. Vollgraff.

DR. LATHAM'S WORKS.*

THE original documents whence we derive our anthropological knowledge of the races of man are scattered through an enormous mass of books, of which they seldom form more than a small part distributed here and there amidst a wilderness of other matter. It is so heavy a task to pick out from histories, books of travel, missionary records, etc., details as to the character of races, that anthropologists who collect and concentrate such knowledge, do most valuable service to their science. In England, Prichard's *Natural History of Man*, and *Physical History of Mankind*, Latham's *Varieties of Man*, Pickering's

* *Descriptive Ethnology*. By R. G. Latham, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. 2 vols. London: Van Voorst. 1859. *Elements of Comparative Philology*. By R. G. Latham, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. London: Walton and Maberly. 1862.

Races; in Germany, Klemm's *Culturgeschichte*, and Waitz's *Anthropology*, now in process of translation and publication by the Anthropological Society, are among the principal books of reference. The newer anthropological work of Dr. Latham's now before us, his *Descriptive Ethnology*, claims a place with these among the books of value to the working student. It is not a new book, but such books in the present state of our study are not superseded, like novels, by newer comers. It will probably be useful to describe shortly its plan and character, and to make particular mention of a few salient points, which will interest readers who would be more apt to refer to it under particular heads, than to go through it *seriatim*.

Dr. Latham puts together a mass of information about a great variety of races in Asia, Africa, and Europe, but with little plan beyond geographical enumeration, and with little attempt to do more than collect and digest facts. He uses physiology to some extent in making out the character of tribes, but depends especially upon language. From the fallacy, however, of taking language as a positive criterion of race, few writers are more free, and he puts this matter in several passages, which are wholesome reading for those who would be likely to fall into the very prevalent heresy of Bunsen and Prichard. "The blood lineage, pedigree, genealogy, descent, or affinity, is the primary ethnological fact. The language is the evidence in favour of it. This may be conclusive, or the contrary. It is rarely conclusive when it stands alone." (Vol. i, p. 357.) Speaking of the question of German and Slavonic race and nationality, he makes the pertinent remark, that half Germany, if it did but know it, is "Slavonia in disguise." Much to the same purpose are his remarks on the Keltic race, which, as he points out, may increase in America, both in numbers and strength of blood, by the marriage of Irish or part Irish settlers with new immigrants of the same race, while, nevertheless, this Irish blood will carry no Irish language with it at all.

"In this way the Kelt family, as tested by its genealogy, may increase; whilst, as tested by its language, it may fall off. Whatever may be its fate in this respect, it is clear that its outward and visible characters have not only a decided tendency to change, but that, these being lost, little is left but an abstraction. Hence the Keltic family, like the Negrian, must be looked upon as the family of a diminishing area." (Vol. ii, p. 505.)

As to Dr. Latham's treatment of language in philological evidence, we cannot, however, speak with more than a very partial approval. He is too easily content with comparing very short vocabularies of languages, twenty to forty words for instance, and deciding by their apparent likeness or unlikeness whether or not such languages are

allied. Now this method, it is true, works in many instances very tolerably—better than it deserves, we had almost said. By keeping to one series of words for comparison he gets at least a fair average, and avoids the dangers of the old practice of comparing any similar words picked out through the whole range of a language, which, as it is possible to find a few words nearly alike in almost any two languages in the world, led of course to absurdly false results. Where, for instance, he compares a short vocabulary of the languages of a tribe North of the Affghan frontier, the Aimak, with a Mongol language, the Kalka, and gives the names for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, in the one, *Nikka, koyar, ghorban, dorban, tabun*; and in the other, *nege, khoyin, gurba, dūrba, tabu*, (vol. i. p. 330), there is hardly any possible room for doubting the real connexion of the two languages. Or again, where he compares the Singhalese with the Sanskrit, and the Hindustan with the Marathi, by means of his specimen vocabulary, the inference would hardly be resisted by any one that the languages in question were closely connected dialects. But in such cases, why could he not have clinched the argument by the proper and necessary appeal to grammatical similarity? Yet it is only in such cases as these that this method really answers at all. Let us take the compared vocabulary of the Jurui of the Malayan peninsula, where, out of twenty words, five, *med*, ‘eye,’ *litig*, ‘tongue,’ *tong*, ‘hand,’ *mitkakok*, ‘sun,’ *bulan*, ‘moon,’ are like Malay, the rest not (vol. ii, p. 486); or the sixteen word vocabulary of Albanian and Romaic (vol. ii, p. 25), where there is no similarity at all. Such a comparison proves nothing to speak of, either for or against, for five words out of twenty are no proof of radical connexion, and, on the other hand, many languages have this radical connexion which might fail to show five similar words in the twenty. So confident is our author, however, in this method that he actually takes the trouble to print an elaborate list of the percentage of similar words as counted out of Siamese, Anamese, and a number of other vocabularies. He even speaks of the Singhalese as being “far more Sanskrit than either the Tamul or the Malayan,” a remark which would make the very hair of an ordinary philologist stand on end with horror, at the idea of the relations of a language to the family it does belong to, being compared as mere matter of more or less with its relations to a family it does not belong to at all.

Among the physiological data which Dr. Latham sets down in his account of one race after another, is a series of details of the transmission of racial peculiarity which has so much anthropological interest, that we give an abridgement of the particulars (Vol. i, p. 201), which Dr. Latham quotes from Mr. Crawford as to the first generation, and from Mr. Yule as to the second and third. The

grandfather, Shive-maong, was a native of Laos; the chief of the country had given him, when five years old, to the King of Ava as a curiosity. When grown up he was of ordinary stature (5 ft. 3½ in), slender, rather delicate, and fairer in complexion than is usual among Burmese. His forehead, cheeks, eyelids, and nose were covered with lank, silky, silver-grey hair, from four to 8 inches long. This remarkable covering extended over the whole body, except the hands and feet, being most plentiful over the spine and shoulders, where the hair was 5 inches long, but more scanty elsewhere. It was permanent. Although but 30 years of age, Shive-maong looked 60, this being due to the peculiarity of his teeth. He had in the lower jaw but five teeth, namely, the four incisors, and the left canine; and in the upper, but four, the two outer ones of which partook of the canine form. The molars were of course totally wanting. What should have been gum, was a hard, fleshy ridge; and, judging from appearances, there was no alveolar process. The few teeth he had were sound, but rather small; and he had never lost any from disease. He stated that he did not shed his infantine teeth till he was 20 years of age, the time of his attaining his full physical development, when they were succeeded, in the usual manner, by the present set. He also expressly asserted that he never had any molars, and that he experienced no inconvenience from the want of them. This hairy man had good features, and was intelligent in mind. At birth, his ears alone were covered with flaxen hair 2 inches long, that on the rest of his body growing afterwards. At 22, the king made him a present of a wife, by whom he had four daughters. The first and second died young, but neither in them nor in the third was there any abnormal characteristic. But the youngest was born with hair on the ears which soon increased all over the body.

Years afterwards, Mr. Yule carried on the description. This daughter, Maphons, had now fully developed her hairy peculiarities, no part of the face but the extreme upper lip being visible for long, hanging, silky hair. In spite of this strange skye-terrier appearance, she was a pleasant and intelligent young woman. Her husband and two boys came with her, the elder an ordinary child, the younger taking the family characteristics, and promising to represent this curious race of "hairy orbits" to the third generation. His mother's dental peculiarity corresponded with her father's in the absence of canines and molars, but she contrived to make the hard ridge of the back part of the gums serve to chew pawn with, like her neighbours.

To pass to questions of the development and degeneration of civilisation, several interesting facts and arguments on these objects are brought forward by Dr. Latham. He looks upon certain of the lower races as outcasts, physically and morally degenerate, and compares,

for instance, the Bushmen of South Africa with those Tungus of Siberia whom loss of domestic animals has thrown down at once in prosperity, and in the scale of civilisation.

“Let a Tungus of any kind live in a steppe or a wood and his habits are modified. Let a rich man become poor, and he goes on foot instead of driving or riding. Erman gives a saddening and sickening account of a poor Tungus and his daughter, in a lone hut, desolate, and isolate. They had simply lost their cattle, and hunted, apart from their fellows, in solitude. A Bushman who has lost his herds is a Tungus without his dogs, reindeer, or horses, and the history of an afflicted family in the South of Africa is, *mutatis mutandis*, the history of an afflicted family in the North of Asia.” (Vol. i, p. 272.)

The civilisation of that most remarkable and peculiar country, China, Dr. Latham maintains with considerable force, cannot justly claim the immense antiquity which has, indeed, been recognised by later ethnographers as, at any rate, monstrously exaggerated, and he moreover suggests the denial of its originality, ascribing it in great measure to contact with post-Christian civilisation, particularly across Asia, which has left, in the often noticed resemblances between Buddhist and Roman Catholic ceremonies, clear traces of Nestorian influence in the early days of Christianity. Without going fully into the long discussion necessary, we think that Dr. Latham's view has in it a partial truth, and that the entire independance of Chinese civilisation has probably been put too strongly; but that, on the one hand, its very peculiar character, its possession of arts so foreign to the rest of the world, that of making cast-iron kettles, for instance, which only date from the last century in England, and on the other hand the absence in China of arts such as alphabetic writing, which they would have adopted from abroad had they been a people prone to adopt, tend in two ways to make Chinese civilisation in great measure a system *per se*, affected to a considerable extent (as in Buddhism and its belongings) by foreign influences, but nevertheless to a large extent peculiar and original.

As to the general question of growth and decrease in human civilisation, the following passage, with which we conclude our remarks on and samples of Dr. Latham's Descriptive Ethnology, is not only a good specimen of his peculiar turn of thought and style, but conveys a piece of practical advice, which, though it does not do justice to much good work which has really been done, and grossly exaggerates the deficiency of our knowledge, is nevertheless, we are sorry to admit, a good deal to the purpose.

“Now, although all inquirers admit that creeds, languages, and social conditions, present the phenomena of growth, the opinions as

to the rate of such growths are varied—and none are of much value. This is because the particular induction required for the formation of anything better than a mere impression has yet to be undertaken—till when one man's guess is as good as another's. The age of a tree may be reckoned from its concentric rings, but the age of a language, a doctrine, or a polity, has neither bark like wood, nor teeth like a horse, nor a register like a child." (Vol. ii, p. 322.)

To turn now to Dr. Latham's *Elements of Comparative Philology*, we may describe this book shortly and effectually, by saying that it is what the author himself intimates, in the first page of his preface, that is, an expansion and continuation of Adelung's *Mithridates*. This accounts at once for its merits and its faults. It contains information about a great variety of little known languages, but the method by which they are handled is now behind the times. The best way in which we can treat the work is to set before our readers a few points which have most struck us among its contents.

Among Dr. Latham's remarks on the general principles of philology, we may notice him taking such phrases as *catch'em, je l'aime*, and pointing out that it is only by what he fairly calls 'printer's philology,' that these phrases are cut in pieces by the apostrophe, whereas, if left to themselves in spoken language they would have become examples of what we call incorporating or polysynthetic words when we meet with them in the languages of American savages (p. 520). On the next page he refers to the view that similar grammatical phenomena turn up again and again in different parts of the world, and under the most varied circumstances.

"The doctrine, then, that the differences in grammatical structure are differences of degree rather than of kind, and that there is nothing in one language, which either as a fragment or a rudiment, is not to be found in another, is contravened by nothing from America."

Dr. Latham does not believe in the extreme antiquity of the Chinese language, as represented by its oldest known books. He thinks the dialect would have changed more in so long a lapse of time as the thousands of years claimed for the antiquity of those early documents.

"The difference between the Mandarin of to-day, and the oldest classical Chinese is (roughly speaking) the difference of two centuries, rather than two millenniums—assuming, of course, anything like an ordinary rate of change." (P. 65.)

This is of course mere guess-work, but still it is worth consideration. From a similar point of view, Dr. Latham discusses the language of the Hebrew scriptures, and puts very pertinently the three alternatives by which he would seek to account for the fact of the almost absolute philological identity of the Hebrew language of those non-Chaldee books which are held to be the earliest of the canon, and those to which a date later by hundreds of years is assigned. They

may, he says, have been brought up to the modern standard of language, when from time to time they were transcribed, as has been done with old English compositions. Or the newer writings may have been written upon the model of the old, just as Ciceronian Latin is written by late Italians. Or the language may have held on for ages with exceptionally little alteration, as has been the case with the Icelandic. This question is of a great deal of importance in Biblical criticism; for, unless one of these alternatives has really taken effect, the similarity of the language of the various Hebrew books of the canon must bring their times of composition much closer together than is commonly supposed.

Among the mass of compared vocabularies of which Dr. Latham's work is full, we may select one of especial interest to the student of human races, that, namely, which shows the close connexion between the languages of the Guanches of the Canary Islands (Lancerotta and Fuerteventura) and the Shelluh of the African continent (P. 541).

<i>English.</i>	<i>Canary.</i>	<i>Shelluh.</i>
Barley	temasin	tunzeen
Sticks	tezzezes	tezezerat
Palm-tree	taginaste	taginast
Petticoat	tahuyan	tahuyat
Water	ahemon	amen
Priest	faycag	faquair
God	acoran	nikoor
Temple	almogaren	talmogaren
House	tamoyanteen	tigameen
Hog	tawaeen	tamouren
Green fig	archormase	akermuse
Sky	tigot	tigot
Mountain	thener	athraar
Valley	adeyhaman	douwaman

To those who deny the validity of the existing evidence for what is called the Aryan theory, which deduces most European languages in quality from some lost tongue, most nearly represented by the existing Sanskrit, and in space from some region of Asia, Dr. Latham offers an argument from what he considers the insufficiency of the evidence. He thinks (p. 611) that there is indeed more presumption that Sanskrit came from Europe, and (p. 651) that Greek is indigenous in Southern Europe. He honestly admits, however, that he has not worked out the evidence on which the Sanskritists base their views. If any student who has really mastered this evidence, and can prove that he has done so, will then undertake to plead the cause of the disbelievers in the Aryan theory, he will certainly make a sensation in the philological world. Merely to say, however, "I am sorry that I have not been able to spend the time and labour wanted to understand the evidence, but my opinion is, that the Sanskritists are all wrong," is a fair way of stating an author's view, but is hardly likely to produce much effect on the external world.